the above listed objects are sacred objects.

In April of 1988, MDAH acquired from an unknown donor a collection containing five objects that had been removed from the burial of an individual at the Tom Harris site (22QU574) in Quitman County, MS. Neither the identity of the individual nor the whereabouts of their human remains is known. The unassociated funerary objects include one lot of ceramic sherds, one lot of daub, one lot of lithic debitage, one lot of faunal bone fragments, and one lot of burial fill matrix.

Determinations Made by the Mississippi Department of Archives and History

Officials at the Mississippi Department of Archives and History have determined that:

- Pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 3001(3)(B), five of the cultural items described above are reasonably believed to have been placed with or near individual human remains at the time of death or later as part of the death rite or ceremony and are believed, by a preponderance of the evidence, to have been removed from a specific burial site of a Native American individual.
- Pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 3001(3)(C), 16 of the cultural items described above are specific ceremonial objects needed by traditional Native American religious leaders for the practice of traditional Native American religions by their present-day adherents.
- Pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 3001(2), there is a relationship of shared group identity that can be reasonably traced between all the cultural items described above and The Chickasaw Nation.

Additional Requestors and Disposition

Lineal descendants or representatives of any Indian Tribe or Native Hawaiian organization not identified in this notice that wish to claim these cultural items should submit a written request with information in support of the claim to Meg Cook, Director of Archaeology Collections, Mississippi Department of Archives and History, Museum Division, 222 North Street, P.O. Box 571, Jackson, MS 39205, telephone (601) 576–6927, email *mcook@mdah.ms.gov,* by April 5, 2021. After that date, if no additional claimants have come forward, transfer of control of the unassociated funerary objects and sacred objects to The Chickasaw Nation may proceed.

The Mississippi Department of Archives and History is responsible for notifying the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas [previously listed as Alabama-Coushatta Tribes of Texas]; Alabama-Quassarte Tribal Town; Coushatta Tribe of Louisiana; Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians; Miami Tribe of Oklahoma; Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians; Quapaw Nation [previously listed as The Quapaw Tribe of Indians]; The Chickasaw Nation; The Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma; The Muscogee (Creek) Nation; The Osage Nation [previously listed as Osage Tribe] that this notice has been published.

Dated: February 12, 2021.

Melanie O'Brien,

Manager, National NAGPRA Program.

[FR Doc. 2021–04568 Filed 3–4–21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312–52–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 731–TA–776–779 (Fourth Review)]

Preserved Mushrooms from Chile, China, India, and Indonesia

Determinations

On the basis of the record [1] developed in the subject five-year reviews, the United States International Trade Commission (''Commission'') determines, pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930 (''the Act''), that revocation of the antidumping duty orders on preserved mushrooms from Chile, China, India, and Indonesia would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.

Background

The Commission instituted these reviews on August 3, 2020 (85 FR 46725) and determined on November 6, 2020 that it would conduct expedited reviews (86 FR 7877, February 2, 2021).

The Commission made these determinations pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)). It completed and filed its determinations in these reviews on March 1, 2021. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 5167 (March 2021), entitled *Preserved Mushrooms from Chile, China, India, and Indonesia: Investigation Nos. 731–TA–776–779 (Fourth Review).*

By order of the Commission.

[1] The record is defined in § 207.2(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.2(f)).

Issued: March 2, 2021.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2021–04613 Filed 3–4–21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

[OMB Number 1121–0309]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed eCollection eComments Requested; Extension of a Currently Approved Collection: International Terrorism Victim Expense Reimbursement Program Application

AGENCY: Office for Victims of Crime, Department of Justice.

ACTION: 60-day notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Justice (DOJ), Office of Justice Programs, Office for Victims of Crime, will be submitting the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. The proposed information collection is published to obtain comments from the public and affected agencies.

DATES: The Department of Justice encourages public comment and will accept input until May 4, 2021.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have additional comments especially on the estimated public burden or associated response time, suggestions, or need a copy of the proposed information collection instrument with instructions or additional information, please contact Victoria Jolicoeur, Office for Victims of Crime, 810 Seventh Street NW, Washington, DC 20531; by facsimile at (202) 305–2440 or by email, to *ITVERP@usdoj.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information are encouraged. Your comments should address one or more of the following four points:

—Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Office for Victims of Crime, including whether the information will have practical utility;

—Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

—Evaluate whether and if so how the quality, utility, and clarity of the